

See page 8

PEACE NEWS

The International Pacifist Weekly

No. 738

August 18th, 1950

THREEPENCE

"I will not
fight again"

— U.S. EX-SOLDIER
TO CONGRESSMEN

MY participation in the armed forces did nothing to further the cause of world peace and democracy, it actually retarded progress toward peace and democracy," says an American ex-Serviceman in a letter to Congressman Melvin C. Price protesting at extension of peace time conscription in the USA.

From his home at 3320 S. Euclid Avenue, Berwyn, Illinois, this ex-serviceman, Joseph A. Pracher sent similar letters to all important Government officials and also informed Lt. Col. Paul G. Armstrong, State Director of the Illinois Select Service System that "I could not participate again in the armed forces of our country."

Force destroys democracy

"Freedom and democracy cannot be taught at the point of a rifle—or with tanks, bombers and warships," the letter continued, "They are taught by the living examples of the Christian way of life. Jesus Christ and Mahatma Gandhi are two fine examples of the good Christian way of life. Sure, the Mahatma was a Hindu; but he was more Christian than most of the so-called Christians are today.

By resorting to force we destroy everything democracy stands for, and consequently, we sow the seeds of totalitarianism as rapidly as we can fire guns and drop bombs. We destroy a democratic freedom with every bullet we fire; and we sow an acre of totalitarian seed with every bomb we drop. In the end, we shall destroy ourselves as well as our imaginary enemy.

It is morally necessary for me to express my views upon the evils fostered by the forces of militarism. I believe militarism to be as immoral and inhuman as any type of police state; it is a shame to any democratic way of life. Furthermore, I do not believe democracy can be preserved for future generations through the implementation of a huge military programme. Fear, militarism and excessive materialism will eventually destroy all democratic freedom and institutions.

What the last war taught me

The last war has given me good cause to reconsider the value of my participation in that it has become perfectly obvious that I had accomplished less than nothing. My participation in the armed forces did nothing to further the cause of world peace and democracy; it actually retarded progress toward peace and democracy.

I have been of the opinion for some time now that I could not participate in any capacity in the armed forces of our country. The thought of bearing arms against my fellow men for a second time is revolting and repulsive.

I have chosen, instead, creative and constructive pacifism in preference to destructive and immoral militarism—regardless of the consequences. Pacifism and democracy are truly Christian; militarism and excessive materialism are obviously anti-Christian. I will, therefore, refuse to cooperate with the evil forces of militarism; I will preach and practise the Sermon on the Mount to the best of my ability.

Y.H.A. LEADER'S WAR-TIME ADVENTURES

In our next issue we hope to give some account of the 21st birthday celebrations of the Youth Hostels Association, which, started by a few enthusiasts in 1926, has no less than 300 hostels and a membership of over 2,000, and, by providing simple accommodation for all, aims at encouraging a love and knowledge of the countryside.

The celebrations commence with the International Rally, to be held on Saturday and Sunday, August 19 and 20 at the Bridgewater Monument Field, Aldbury Common, where 1,500 hostellers from abroad will camp with members from this country. It is impossible to estimate how many international friendships owe their origin to rallies of this nature.

The 21st Birthday Festival will be held a week later on Saturday, August 26, com-

Liverpool pacifist's appeal fails INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY GETS A SET BACK

Blow to rights of lawful assembly

THE result of the Liverpool Poster Trial Appeal marks a definite setback for freedom of speech in this country.

Five PPU members appealed last week against the conviction of the Liverpool Stipendiary Magistrates, last May, when they were arrested in the vicinity of Liverpool Cathedral on the occasion of a military demonstration and church parade attended by Field-Marshal Montgomery.

They were carrying PPU and Quaker peace posters mounted on poles, and were charged with behaving in a disorderly manner whereby a breach of the peace might have been caused. They were each fined 40s. after a trial lasting several days.

As counsel for defence said at the time, the assertions of the police went to the heart of the liberty of the individual and the claim of lawful assembly and freedom of speech.

The defendants were Isobel Burns, Mary Cummins, Mary Harland, Thomas Harland and Hugh Lytton.

Mr. R. S. Trotter prosecuted and defence counsel was Mr. Colin Cunningham. Opening his case, Mr. Trotter outlined the evidence and put the police witnesses into the box. The appeal involved the hearing of the whole case which was practically the same as that already reported in the May 26, June 9 and June 16 issues of PN.

The case for the police rested on their assertion that the crowd had resented the presence of the defendants and the banners which they were carrying; that the defendants had shouted slogans; that although the defendants moved when ordered, they did so with bad grace and showed every intention of trying to get back to the Cathedral; that they were finally arrested after Isabel Burns had stated that they did intend to go back to the Cathedral. The defence was a denial of these assertions.

There was thus a fundamental disagreement about the actual facts, and Mr. Cunningham suggested that the police had acted over zealously in view of the duty they had to perform in controlling the crowd and that they had subsequently attempted to justify their action.

He further suggested that the case had assumed a political significance in view of the fact that the original charge had been brought under the Public Order Act but that it had afterwards been decided to soft pedal the political aspect to make the offence one of simple disorder.

POLICE AND PACIFISM

The suggestion that the police had been actuated by political motives and had arranged their evidence accordingly, was strongly resented by Mr. Trotter who recalled the police witnesses to the box to deny the assertion.

Addressing the court, Mr. Cunningham claimed that the appellants were exercising a constitutional right to be present and to witness to their belief. Many of the posters carried were a paraphrase of words which had the highest Biblical sanction and perhaps the action of the appellants in desiring to display such posters at the Cathedral was more in keeping with the purpose of that building than that it should have been used as a saluting base.

Since the original charge had been withdrawn, there could no longer be any presumption that they went with disorderly intent. When the police intervened, they were only on the fringe of the crowd, the principal event taking place at least a quarter of a mile away. It was clear that it was the banners that attracted the attention of the police.

If they had exhibited the good humour and easy temper of the crowd, the charges would never have arisen.

It was unthinkable that any crowd should be provoked by such conduct, and in spite of the police assertions, they had

not brought one single witness from the crowd to support them.

The arrests were really occasioned when Hugh Lytton objected to being forcibly pushed by the police.

After quoting previous High Court decisions which supported his contention, Mr. Cunningham stated that the duty of police officers did not include the suppression of truth and asked the court to vindicate the right of the appellants to witness to their beliefs.

The police, he suggested, had in mind only the fact that the appellants were pacifists and that they were not going to have them or their posters at any cost—but the cost was the forfeiture of the rights of those people.

The penalty imposed upon them by the lower court was so small that it was obvious they were not appealing against the fine but against the denial of their rights.

CROWD AND CONTROL

In giving his judgment the Assistant Recorder said that the appellants had every right to an investigation as to whether the previous fine had been rightly imposed. "To get the case in correct proportion I must examine it from the common sense point of view of what is the function of the police on such an occasion. The safety of a crowd is only insured if their actions are severely controlled by the police.

"The crowd was there for a different reason to that of the appellants. I completely believe that the views of the appellants are sincerely and honestly held; their view is that peace is not promoted by armed forces and that armaments may well lead to war. But there is another point of view—that peace can be secured by the existence of arms, and the people who join the TA are those who hold that latter view.

"It is not necessary for me to say which view is right, but it is obvious that the crowd was composed of people not likely to share the views of the appellants.

"The police state that the appellants forced their way through the crowd. Apart from any political significance, I can well imagine that such action in itself would be likely to cause trouble. When there is the added fact that the banners were of a pacifist nature, the chances of resentment are increased still more.

"Reluctantly, because I recognise that they are honest people, I come to the conclusion that on the issue of fact I prefer the evidence of the police and accept it."

Japan is to be remilitarised

—SUNDAY OBSERVER

THE full significance of American policy in Japan was clearly revealed in an outspoken report published in last Sunday's Observer from its Tokyo correspondent, Michael Davidson.

During the American occupation, he says, the Japanese nation has "passed, almost without noticing it, from a state of abjectness and self-dedication to the ideal of peace, to the dangerous condition of being America's chief military base in the Pacific."

This, he asserts, is a "terrible anomaly. A people, 90 per cent. of whom passionately want peace, is suddenly active in war."

American military planes, he points out, are flying from Japanese soil; Japanese ships are carrying war supplies to Korea, and Japanese labour is employed on military work.

Japanese had been won for peace

And "a nation which for five years has spiritually been practising a sort of Coué course in neutrality and peace suddenly finds itself physically an essential plank in United States military power without such is the cynicism of history—so much as a by-your-leave.

"The immediate tragedy of this situation," the report continues, "is that the ordinary, humble Japanese really have dedicated themselves to peace; in their hearts, as well as their minds, they are convinced of the madness and the crime of war. In their souls they were implementing the noblest decision a nation can make. But the cruelty of events has made fools of them."

Sooner or later, Mr. Davidson adds, there will, of course, be a Japanese army and another Japanese military machine. This is one of the chief topics of discussion in Tokyo.

The old guard reappear

He admits that there is still some difference of opinion within the Supreme Command of the Allied Power (SCAP). Some officers of high rank regard an anti-Communist Japanese army as essential to American security, while others see in rearmament a rash and provocative move amounting possibly to an invitation to war.

It is plain, however, he adds, that the Supreme Allied Command is "allowing" talk of rearmament—"a thing that would not have been tolerated a few months ago."

A group of "purged" Japanese generals who have been living in obscurity were lately allowed to be interviewed by newspapers and to urge immediate rearmament—opinions which, says Mr. Davidson, "they would not have dared to breathe a short while ago."

The nucleus of an army is now being formed; the 75,000 strong National Police Reserve will be a highly-trained and adequately armed quasi-military body.

And whatever this body may become, he says, Japan is definitely resuming the character of a police state and intelligent Japanese of Liberal opinion admit that this is so.



The football season opens this week.

PEACE NEWS

3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4

Stamford Hill 2262

Available from Newsagents and Booksellers,
or direct from the above address.

POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Great Britain and abroad: Three months,
4s. 4d.; six months, 8s. 8d.; twelve
months 16s. 6d.

A Policeman's Lot

FAR exceeding all other political questions in importance for this country is that of how far the British Government is committed to American foreign policy.

For sheer wickedness that policy leaves nothing to choose between itself and that of the Kremlin, and makes cynical nonsense of all professions of democratic principle.

For this country, the situation is as fantastic as it is intolerable. Britain, with other Western nations, is lined up behind General MacArthur, head of the UN "Police Army," now engaged in the (to most British people) highly commendable task of resisting Communist aggression in Korea and vindicating the principle of international law.

But the Commander-in-Chief of Democracy is a man of parts. He fills more than one post.

Besides leading a great Democratic Crusade, he is carrying out two other enterprises each of which, viewed separately without the distraction of anti-Communist propaganda, would be wholeheartedly condemned by public opinion both here and in America as a violation of every principle for which the war was professedly fought.



In Formosa, he is forming what to all intents and purposes is an open alliance with Chiang Kai-shek, whose name is synonymous for every kind of reactionary corruption.

In this he is not only acting contrary to British policy. Nor is he only encouraging the Chinese people to believe that the might of Western democracy is to be used to re-establish the tyranny from which they had finally rid themselves after long civil war.

He is also presenting the propagandists of Moscow with the best possible justification for all their professed fears and suspicions.

In Japan, he is pursuing an objective which in some ways is even worse. He is forcing militarism back upon a nation which has constitutionally repudiated it.



It is doubtless a difficult and delicate problem for our Government to decide where United Nations policy of resisting aggression ends and United States policy of bolstering Asiatic reaction begins. They have, we suppose, no formula for distinguishing between MacArthur the Chief of World Police and MacArthur the reviver of Japanese militarism and Chinese Fascism.

But Britain, as one of the constables in the World Police Force, must surely complain that a world policeman's lot is not a happy one.



So far our Government spokesmen have been silent on that situation and the Press with honourable exceptions ignores it.

One possible reason for their silence, we hope, is that an embarrassed government is considering what to do about it.

But another and sinister possibility is that Britain itself is about to be a party to a similar policy nearer home.

For our Government has not yet disclosed its intentions regarding the rearming of Germany, for which Mr. Churchill and others here and on the Continent are clamouring (and of which cartoonist Low, in Labour's Leading Daily, is obviously in favour). Such hints as we are permitted to grasp, however, suggests that some degree of German rearmament is assured.



Yet German opposition to rearmament is as articulate as that of Japan. All the more democratic and progressive elements in German public opinion have pronounced emphatically against it.

If German and Japanese militarism is re-established by the Western democracies; if indeed a British Labour Government is going to permit without protest, let alone connive at, the revival of that identical militarism for the destruction of which the bloodiest war in history has just been fought, then the final seal will be put upon everything pacifists have ever said about the imbecile futility of war.

Pacifism will certainly be justified beyond argument. But we would rather not buy our justification at the cost of such national shame and humiliation.

Commentary

By DOUGLAS ROGERS

THE articles and reports about atomic warfare, written by people who would rather gamble on war than peace, make pathetic reading.

If you put your faith in the building up of force as a deterrent to force, you must also necessarily consider the fact that you may have to use that force. Thus, for example, the Home Office has published a manual of civil defence against atomic attack. And thus, the manual, by its nature, has to persuade us all to "re-adjust" our outlook on the atomic bomb.

When the first atomic bombs were dropped the horror of it staggered the world temporarily into the view that war had now become beyond consideration.

Now, alas, we are all having to consider what to do if (as is possible) atomic bombs are dropped on us. We have to consider whether or not 50,000 people would be killed per bomb or whether, by certain precautions, the figure could be reduced. We have to consider whether such a bomb would wipe out the whole of our particular city or whether it would merely wipe out part of it. We have to consider whether after exposure to gamma rays we should be advised to abstain from sexual intercourse for about three months so as to lessen the possibility of passing on the gene of sterility (I think that's the phrase) that might bring the human race to an end. We have to consider. . . . But must one go on?

Who are the defeatists

ONCE I used to get comfort from the persistence of life, from the way the wild flowers and trees and little rock plants have crept about the bomb sites of London, from the way in which human beings pick up again the threads of life and carry on come what may, striving always, believing in the better things to come.

But what use is it all if we have got to adapt our minds to horrors like this? How can anyone with a spark of humanity in him—how can anyone who has ever loved another human being, consider a continuance of human life in such circumstances. The very act of adapting the mind to its acceptance destroys some part of the soul.

How can we consider going on living after such a happening? Who would want to live—afterwards? What mother wants to sit in a dug-out, under three feet six inches of earth, holding a sheet of brown paper over herself and her children and wondering when to emerge into the desert of rubble and flames and invisible death?

Who, then, are really the defeatists? Which of us really love our countries?

Dr. Soper and Communism

ONE of the saddest comments that have appeared on Dr. Soper's speech at the Methodist conference was in the Socialist Leader in an editorial article entitled "Crackpot Pacifism."

The editor of the ILP weekly comments: "It is this sort of twaddle that is damning

pacifism and the anti-war movement among ordinary folk and which is making our work more difficult than it should be."

Communist forces, says the editor, "do not come to power temporarily; if they come, they come to stay. Secondly, Dr. Soper and his friends would quickly discover that pacifism is not included in the vocabulary of Communism. The communists would make short shrift of Dr. Soper and his propaganda."

Now the extraordinary thing about all this is not that the editor of the Socialist Leader should disagree with Dr. Soper (for the ILP is not a pacifist party), but that he should think that Soper's speech is inconsistent with pacifism—"damning pacifism." Furthermore, the editor, with an intellectual blindness more befitting the editors of less intelligent journals, has leapt to the conclusion that Dr. Soper is somehow advocating invasion by Stalinist troops, if not actually embracing Stalinism himself.

In fact, all that Dr. Soper said was that if the choice had to be made between a Third World War and being overrun by Communist forces, he would rather take his chance with the Communists. In other words, he believes the chances of mankind (in any civilised form) surviving the Third World War are less than those of overcoming Communism by non-violent means.

Who would choose war?

NOw every pacifist is of necessity pledged to this view since he rejects war in any circumstances. And for the love of me I cannot see why people who are not absolute pacifists should not also be driven to accept the logic of Dr. Soper's view.

One may believe that by political and economic readjustments of human affairs it is possible to avoid war and also avoid Communism, but if the worst comes to the worst and one must make the choice Dr. Soper is facing, then, it seems to me, no one in his right mind can choose war. The ghastly destruction of human life (perhaps fatal to man's continuance), of man's material achievements in the construction of cities, industry, organised society and the arts, and of man's moral and spiritual achievements, appears threatened so absolutely that the very contemplation of acquiescence in it seems an indication of insanity.

Confusing the ordinary folk

IN the face of this, it seems to me, sane persons must necessarily consider new attitudes of mind and methods of action that rejects violence totally.

The issue arose plainly in the debate in Picture Post between Dr. Soper and Middleton Murry when the latter's argument really boiled down to the fact that he regards Communism as so complete and absolute a spiritual degradation that he would prefer annihilation in fighting it to submission. He, of course, also thinks that Communism is permanent and unalterable. His argument is at least logical even though I feel he simply pushes to one side the spiritual degradation that would be caused by a Third World War—even if it "defeats" Communism.

I wish the Socialist Leader would be more precise because week after week it is

printing powerful anti-war propaganda and in one recent issue it had anti-war slogans printed in huge type at the foot of each page. I am quite sure these slogans, plus an attack on Dr. Soper, are more confusing to "ordinary folk" than anything Dr. Soper has said.

The need for non-violence

ISUGGEST more attention should be paid to the relationship between cause and effect in politics.

One should remember that the Soviet Union was conceived in violence, born in violence, nurtured within by violence and surrounded without by violence. The Communist states of Eastern Europe were also born in and out of violence. And violence is the story of the Far East.

Human beings who live in such an atmosphere react in a certain way. Faced with non-violence, in practice and in spirit, it is not illogical to hope they might behave in a different way. These attitudes between man and man are contagious. Violence—personal hostility—tends to breed violence. Non-violence—personal love—tends to breed its like.

This is not sentimentalism; it is science. It is difficult to put into practice; but ultimately it is the only alternative to the gospel of despair now preached by Middleton Murry.

Why Nehru said "No"

IN my last Commentary I referred to the difficulties that face India in supporting the United Nations in Korea. "How," I wrote, "can it support a 'democratic' campaign that fails to renounce imperialism?"

Since I wrote that, Pandit Nehru has made frank criticisms. The Manchester Guardian reports him as saying that "India had declined to provide material aid to South Korea when she saw that United Nations action was likely to be extended to include other situations, such as Formosa and India-China."

Nehru told the Indian Parliament: "The fact of this enlargement seemed to us not only wrong, but to have dangerous consequences from the viewpoint of world peace. Therefore, right from the beginning, we made it clear that we supported the Security Council resolutions, but did not extend our support to anything else beyond that."

Formosa: are we committed?

ACTUALLY, General MacArthur's trip to Formosa and his talks with Chiang Kai-shek must be causing embarrassment in a lot of places. Has MacArthur given Chiang to understand that the United States (and perhaps the "United Nations") are his ally?

To what extent is Chiang using Formosa as a base for air attacks on the Chinese mainland and to blockade its ports? To what extent is he preparing military forces there with the object of regaining his old power?

If Chiang is planning and, in fact, waging war on China how are Britain and the other countries that recognise the government of Mao Tse-tung going to reconcile this recognition with America's pledge of protection of Formosa. If Chiang is attacking China hasn't that country, by all the "rules" these countries accept, the right to hit back in self-defence?

HOPE

HOPE," wrote Messrs. Beaumont and Fletcher, who saw eye to eye on the matter—"Hope never leaves a wretched man that seeks her."

And those were precisely my sentiments some 400 years later, on receiving the following letter from a reader:

"I promised that the first post-war credit I received I would give to Peace News. As I have just received those credits I forward a cheque for £20 for the Fund. May I say how splendid Peace News is?"

Communications of this nature undoubtedly help to sustain my hope that we shall get the money we need to maintain the enlarged PN. But, though taking nourishment, my hope is not yet out of danger.

The response to Vera Brittain's appeal is very promising; the pace is gradually accelerating, but is by no means yet displaying Olympic form.

It is not everybody who can count on windfalls or post-war credits. But there is, however, a sure and certain way of finding money for Peace News. You beg it from your friends.

This sounds the hardest way of all. So it is if you beg large sums. But if you ask such small sums that they haven't the face to refuse, you will find it the easiest form of highway robbery yet invented.

All you don't even need a pistol for it. Cards—harmless weapons, yet—naturally far more effective than lethal weapons.

We have plenty in stock.

THE EDITOR

Contributions since Aug. 4: £105 4s. 9d. Total since Jan. 1: £487 15s. 8d.

Please make cheques, etc., payable to Peace News Ltd., and address them to Vera Brittain, Treasurer, Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, N.4.

EXCUSE PLEASE, WHO IS THE ENEMY?

HE asked the question during an English Class in a camp for Displaced Poles in East Africa. No books were available and the reading matter consisted of an article from the Listener describing how the underground movement had smuggled out a Polish flag without the knowledge of the enemy.

He asked the question with some bitterness, for Germany and Russia had each occupied half his country, and at the time Russia was being acclaimed as Britain's newest ally.

The same question must have been in the minds of those Poles in exile who found after the war that the Allies who entered the war to protect them agreed to the Curzon Line whereby Russia remained in a large part of Polish territory.

There must be many people puzzled by the question today. The British who remember the epic defence of Stalingrad; the relatives of the thousands of Germans killed on the Russian Front; or the British prisoners of war from the Far East, many of them still suffering in mind and body from their treatment in the Japanese prison camps.

What of the many hundreds who laid down their lives building the Burma Railroad which has been called Railroad of Death? Must it not seem strange that a Peace Treaty is now being proposed with Japan that she may provide bases for America as a protection against Russia?

What about Germany, now divided into two, what of France and West Germany, who in three great wars have been on oppos-

ing sides and have now united to operate the Schuman Plan.

China, Malaya, and Greece are all divided against themselves since the war; the Indians and the Africans in South Africa who fought as our Allies, now find themselves discriminated against solely on account of their colour.

The question in the title indeed seems pertinent. A war to end war is a fallacy, there are too many opportunities for reorganisation with a different nation cast as Enemy Number One!

A better way of sharing the world's goods must be found. The land hungry, the starving, the impoverished, fall an easy prey to Communist promises of fair shares for all.

We who believe in and value Democracy must share the good things of life because we believe in the Brotherhood of Man. We need a world plan which all can respect and in which all have their place. To establish it will take all our energies. In concentrating on it we shall find the fear of a rival ideology recede.

If Senator McMahon's suggestions of spending for Peace instead of for war could be implemented, the obvious advantages of a peaceful way of life would be easily demonstrated, it would involve less financial expenditure, and better still, no lives would be lost.

The ordinary people everywhere feel the need for Peace, and are willing to work for it. They must not be diverted from this by Power Politics.

"Excuse please, who is the enemy?"

EILEEN FLETCHER

HIROSHIMA DAY BAN IN BERLIN

BERLIN pacifists and world citizens were forbidden by the American Military Government to hold their 1950 World Peace Day Demonstration on the Anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima.

In 1949 eleven West Berlin peace organisations formed a "Committee for World Peace Day, August 6, 1949" under the chairmanship of a leading world citizen, Manfred Pahl-Rugenstein.

As was reported in Peace News last year, a big demonstration was held in the French sector, in an open-air theatre, and a large bronze lamp, bearing the inscription "Above all nations—humanity; August 6, 1945," was lit.

In 1950, the committee, enlarged but still under the same chairmanship, planned a demonstration for Aug. 6 in the American sector, for which permission was granted by the German authorities (who could hardly refuse it since all the organisations were licenced by the West Berlin magistrate) subject to the approval of the American Military Government.

Taking with them copies of the speeches to be made at the demonstration, Manfred Pahl-Rugenstein and Prof. Dr. Rudolf Schottlaender asked for an interview with the responsible officer, Mr. Bond, at the "Public Safety" Bureau of the American Military Government (Omgus) in Berlin-Zehlendorf.

The new Gestapo?

They were refused an interview, Mr. Bond sending out his secretary with a curt "No" to the deputation and refusing to say anything of the political content of the intended speeches.

Prof. Schottlaender, a German Jew, protested to the secretary that this was precisely the manner he had known earlier from the Gestapo, but she replied that her instructions were to say "No" and send the deputation away.

Commenting on this treatment Mr. Pahl-Rugenstein said: "This method is indeed for the Russian propaganda that only Eastern Germany are friends of peace to be found. It is a signal moreover that all people who wish to have truth and freedom in a peaceful world have to work together."

Berlin's message to Hiroshima

In a message to the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, sent in the name of thousands of inhabitants of Berlin who are members of several pacifist unions and organisations," the committee declared:

We speak to you not as subjects of a state whose former government made a disastrous alliance with your former government, but as fellow-men, co-inhabitants of the earth, as survivors to survivors and finally as inhabitants of a large city which lost more than half a million during World War II.

Our ardent hope for a peaceable future has not been fulfilled. We speak now because bloody experience has taught us that war does not solve but increases the problems of mankind. Pacifism means to the profession of a positive and constructive work in order to exclude the deeper causes of war.

War of one state against another is a crime against the commonwealth of all nations. We refuse to sign a call to outlaw the atomic bomb so long as it is not linked with the outlawing of civil war.

Five causes of war

We see an immediate danger to world peace in the following:

1. The preservation of national sovereignty;
2. The absence of organisation to preserve international law;
3. The manufacture of armaments;
4. The use of economic resources and half of the world's revenue for the armaments race;
5. The fact that governments have not departed from the old ways which lead inevitably to war whilst at the same time they denounce those individuals and political groups who do so as "traitors to their country."

We call for support for the following action:

1. "Mundialisation," i.e., the declaration of the readiness to put the territory of a town or community with their properties under the control of a future world-government;

2. As the first common step, all towns and communities "mundialised" in this way should demand immediate elections for a parliament of all nations of the world, preceded by a legal democratic procedure in every country in order to elect one deputy for one million inhabitants.

We are firmly convinced that we shall turn the destiny of the world if the individual person is conscious of the real power which is in his hand by the profession to peace.

Let us be newly united in the future by this common striving.

In Stuttgart

SIX hundred people gathered for a Christian-Jewish remembrance service on Hiroshima Day in St. Mark's Church, Stuttgart, Germany (U.S. Zone).

The Stuttgart sections of the War Resisters' International, Fellowship of Reconciliation and other peace organisations collaborated.

Rev. Daur recalled the moment of the dropping of the first bomb, and stressed that neither demonstrations nor petitions against the use of atomic weapons can be successful unless man himself produces a change of heart. The Church, which has begun to recognise its mission in the service of peace, knows this.

"The Evangelical Church Synod welcomes the recognition of conscientious objection in our constitution, and calls on its members never again to take part in war preparations. Violence brings no solution of the problems on whose account violence is used," he declared.

Appeal to women

Dorothea Pfeiffer spoke for WOMAN, the world-wide mothers' movement, and charged women, as guardians of peace and life, to pledge themselves that never again should any mother's child be murdered.

The Rev. Kroon, of Amsterdam, saw in the grim happenings in Hiroshima a direct connection with all the hatred that for thousands of years had been manifested as a sin against the spirit between Jews and non-Jews. Progress was sown by tears and suffering. It was time that the recognition of this showed us the way to a peaceful future and the fellowship of all peoples.

Helene Metz, by her deeply beautiful rendering of some of Bach's Lieder, helped to make the evening into a real hour of remembrance. R.L.

From the other side

IMADE up my mind when I was captured that I would not listen to anything these people told me. But you do not need telling, you can see for yourself.

"I saw it all the way along and I am sick in my heart at what our people are doing. Everytime I hear our planes my belly turns over with disgust.

"You can see for yourself that the Southern Koreans want to go with the North and the further South the Korean Peoples Army goes the more people they are going to get.

"Not a man nor woman supports Rhee, and if we had left them alone it would have all been over in 10 days, and probably some people in the States would have lost a lot of money.

"As it is it has taken a little longer and ruined hundreds of thousands of people, but its finished just the same. These people have won the war, and killing more people the way we are is just savagery.

"I thought America was a civilised country. I hope to God we will be intelligent enough to get out."

—Major Charles T. Barter, 63rd Field Artillery Battalion, USA, to Alan Winnington, Daily Worker reporter in N. Korea (Daily Worker, Aug. 14, 1950).

Ten Years Ago

From Peace News, August 16, 1940

The following two communiques refer to the same battle:

The biggest aerial battle so far fought over Libya between fighter aircraft took place on Thursday, when a formation of Gladiators engaged a much larger force of Italian CR 32 and CR 42 aircraft.

Although outnumbered by more than two to one the Gladiators engaged the enemy and pressed home the attack with such determination that 15 Italian fighters were destroyed.

Two of our aircraft have so far failed to return.

—RAF communiqué, Aug 9

In Northern Africa, on the border of Cyrenaica, 16 Italian fighter aeroplanes engaged 27 British machines in furious combat. In spite of the enemy's numerical superiority the gallant Italian pilots managed to shoot down five British aircraft. Two Italian aircraft failed to return.

—Italian communiqué, Aug 9

August 18, 1950, PEACE NEWS—3

FACTS AND FIGURES

XI. International Lending

PRIOR to World War I, Great Britain was the chief capital exporting country of the world. Overseas assets, mainly long-term private investments, had been estimated at about \$18,000 m. in 1913. (Cf. League of Nations, "Economic Survey," 1931-32, p. 37.)

France lent \$8,700 m. to other countries partly to Tsarist Russia for armaments, railways, etc.; the debts were later repudiated by the Soviets—and Germany invested \$5,600 m. abroad.

The U.S. had been a debtor country at that time, but then she became a creditor as a result of war supplies to the Allied Powers.

After World War I Great Britain still remained the leading creditor country, in spite of heavy losses of former overseas assets.

In the middle of the 1920s the U.S. became the principal source of foreign loans. Large sums were raised for Central Europe, Central America and Canada. (Cf. "International Investment," Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1937, p. 166). Her private investments abroad amounted to

PRODUCTIVE and UNPRODUCTIVE LENDING

Methods of raising loans on capital markets need not be described here, although such an investigation would provide interesting evidence regarding occurrences of profiteering and market-rigging on the one side and human cupidity and stupidity on the other. (Cf. L. H. Jenks, "Migration of British Capital," Chap. IX).

With regard to purposes of loans we may broadly distinguish between those serving useful economic development: such as for railways, public utility enterprises (gas, electricity, telephone, etc.), mines and factories and so forth; and other types of loans the proceeds of which are wasted for armaments, attempted "currency stabilisation" (replacement of losses due to "capital flight" or speculation) etc. Loans for armaments were often not repaid, as they had political basis.

The debtor country usually imports various essential goods (machines, equipment) after receipt of a productive loan and

"AID" for CONSTRUCTION or DESTRUCTION?

After World War II the extent of destruction and disruption of economic life in Europe was far worse than in 1919.

In spite of UNRRA and small relief-loans most of the European countries were unable to pay for essential imports which, at that time, only America could provide.

Great Britain had an initial advantage in buying because she obtained a \$3,750 m. loan from the U.S. Government (the first instalment of debt service \$120 m., will be due next year). Reconstruction in Europe proceeded slowly and private loans from the U.S. were not available.

It was realised that only large-scale help by the U.S. Government could "rescue Europe from economic collapse and chaos," as stated in the Committee Report on the Marshall Plan. The original aim, expressed by Mr. G. Marshall in his speech on June 5, 1947 was the following: "Our policy is

not directed against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos..."

The signing of the North Atlantic Pact (Cmd. 7692) created a new situation. The original aim of the "joint recovery programme" is no longer valid. Industrial production in Europe and the U.S. will be adjusted to objectives of the new armaments race which will necessitate additional spending of huge sums and "switching" of resources from constructive to destructive purposes. Consequently, economic recovery in Western Europe will be slowed down and may come to a standstill. In Britain, output of war supplies will be doubled within two years (Financial Times, Aug. 5).

The comparison of sums allocated for recovery and new armaments is given in the following table:

E.R.P. (European Recovery)—GRANTS & NEW WAR EXPENDITURE

| (in millions) | U.S. Aid granted expend. | U.K. Aid recvd. expend. | FRANCE Aid recvd. expend. |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Total Aid 1948-March, 1950 | \$8,726 | \$2,391 | \$1,839 |
| Military Budget, 1950/51 | — \$13,500 | — £780 | — £500 |
| New Budget, 1950/51 | — \$23,500 | — £1,100 | — £900 |

Source: Reports in Financial Times.

In the Memorandum of the British Government sent to President Truman (Financial Times, Aug. 4) it was pointed out that the extent to which this country can go towards the new limit of expenditure—£3,400 m. over the next three years—depends on the assistance of the U.S.

MILLIONS for WEAPONS—8 cts. PER HEAD for "DEVELOPMENT"

As Britain and France are unable to finance the additional burden, the U.S. is expected to cover about two-thirds of the increase. If such a large proportion of economic resources is wasted on armaments, capital exports to "undeveloped" countries in Asia, Africa, and South America will remain quite inadequate and "backward" areas will be left rotting.

A contrast to the cost of the "defence drive," which exhausts the economic resources of the West, is provided by the size of loans of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for "productive investment." The total of loans made available until March 1950 amounted to \$580 m., of which France (still conducting a colonial war) got \$250 m., Netherlands (after termination of the war in Indonesia) obtained \$190 m. and India—with a population of 350 m.—received \$28 m., i.e. eight U.S. cents per head.

In the meantime the USSR has become the capital exporting country for Eastern Europe and a large part of Asia, providing machines, equipment, etc., for industrialisation

The new "drive for arms production," as stated there, will mean "real and substantial sacrifice by the British people" and delay recovery and investment plans. In France rearmament will be carried out on a similar scale.

Victory for race tolerance

Katherine Dunham, world-famous artist and unrivalled exponent of native African dance, has a fresh laurel to add: that of winning a racial-tolerance fight. Refused, along with Marian Anderson, the world's greatest contralto, rooms in a San Paulo (Brazil) leading hotel, Katherine Dunham created a national sensation by suing the Hotel Esplanada. Responsible voices all over Brazil came to her aid.

A bill was then introduced to make discrimination a criminal offence with penalties ranging up to 20,000 cruzeiros (about £250) plus three months to a year in prison.

Minister of Labour, Mr. Isaacs, has given an assurance that Class Z reservists who have become conscientious objectors since leaving the services will not be overlooked and necessary guidance will be given them.

More news of Russian zone pacifists in

REPORT FROM BERLIN

UNABLE to attend the Council Meeting of the War Resisters' International held recently in Turin, Italy, Heinz Kraschutzki sent the following report.

It was prefaced with a reminder that it was his personal opinion and should never be taken as the general opinion of the people of Berlin. "Such a general opinion," he declared, "does not exist. This city of Berlin is perhaps suffering more than any other place from the tension between two hostile ideologies, but because of different opinions that meet and wrestle and mix here, it seems to me to be one of the most interesting places in the world."

A captain in the German Navy in World War I, Heinz Kraschutzki has since been a leading figure in the German anti-war movement. In 1927 he was



LE T us first of all analyse the situation.

In the Eastern countries a certain economic progress is visible. They are proud of it, and they claim that it has been achieved without American help, so that it is more solid than the fabulous recovery of Western Germany, which is artificial and would collapse should the influx of dollars cease.

But as for the maintenance of human rights, the situation has deteriorated considerably.

In the Eastern Zone of Germany arrests are frequent and the arrested people are seldom allowed to remain in contact with their families. The fear of spies is predominant and the main reason for the many arrests. Besides that, complaints of teachers, civil servants, etc., of the ever-increasing intolerance of the regime are more frequent than ever before.

A steady stream of refugees from the Eastern Zone comes to Western Berlin in order to get over to the west. And the more the leading persons of the predominant SED (Communist Party) realise that the vast majority of the people are against them, the more they tighten their methods.

A London writer who had published reports about Eastern and Western Berlin after having visited the city, said to me: "I should go myself to help the East in their fervent efforts to build up the country, but the price of losing my personal liberty is too high for me." I think these words characterise the situation.

Peace campaign

There is a steady campaign for Peace. In the West it is the general opinion that this is only hypocrisy in order to conceal military intentions. I am firmly convinced that such an accusation is not fair.

You cannot prepare the people for an aggressive war by preaching that war is hell and that peace is the highest of all ideals.

I am sure that they mean peace, and so are friends of mine with a long pacifist record, who are living in Eastern Germany. I come to the point when dealing with the Korean conflict. But they are firmly convinced that the West is preparing to attack the East and, in their opinion, the only possible means of defence is armaments.

People's police

The so-called "Volkspolizei" in Eastern Germany is not an army fit for aggressive purposes. An old pacifist friend of mine who is himself in the Volkspolizei (people's police) though not in the armed police, only in the investigation service for the price-regulations, told me a few days ago that he had never heard anything about heavy armaments and that he did not believe in such news.

The Volkspolizei is meant for something different.

The Russians have sincerely pleaded for an evacuation of Germany by all the four powers. Even fierce adversaries of the Russians in the Eastern Zone assured me that they really mean it. They have the experience that their own soldiers are being corrupted by their prolonged stay in Germany.

They see that the general standard of life is superior to that in the USSR, so that the assurance that their home-country was a paradise for the working-class is contrary to facts. The Volkspolizei is meant to maintain the actual regime in case the Russian troops should retire because, without a strong police force, it would collapse immediately.

The Volkspolizei could be compared with the police of the Union of South Africa in the Western world. Both have the task to keep down the mass of the population for the benefit of a small ruling class, the Communist minority in Eastern Germany, the white people in South Africa. Both are, of course, absolutely odious and detrimental to true democracy. But both are not a menace to the peace of the world.

That the intensive peace propaganda in the East of Europe is done by mass parades of a half military character is no sign of any aggressive intention, though we ourselves utterly resent such means of propaganda. Conservative in their means, as all Communists are, they think that mass demonstrations are the only way to influence the people; the Marxist ideology is one of the effect of masses, utterly opposed to any kind of individualism. As our movement is based on the individual conscience, it has to be opposed to such means.

We should see the danger of mass psychosis that goes with such methods, but we should not see a will to war in it.

Recently, pacifism and the idea of a neutralised Germany have been put on the list of those movements that are officially considered as dangerous. This does not mean a will to war, either. But the Communists, slaves of the ideas Marx uttered one century ago, firmly believe that the Capitalist world has got to attack them before succumbing. And, using a very old argument known to us, they say that everybody who is not willing to take arms is practically helping the "enemy."

Is there much difference between this argument and all that certain people in England, France, etc., say, who claim that the pacifist, for being unwilling to defend the Western world with arms against the Soviet, is a secret agent of the Kremlin?

Practically, this ban against pacifists is not yet so very effective, and it seems to be rather unpopular. We are able to keep contacts with our members and friends in the Eastern Zone of Germany. We do it, not by any kind of secret propaganda, but openly. Hitherto, no mishaps have occurred.

Western Germany

NOW to the West. More and more the anti-Soviet propaganda succeeds in creating a real panic that a Russian onslaught is imminent. I cannot say whether this propaganda is sincere, a result of genuine fear; or whether it is artificial; meant to direct more capital into the armaments industry. Anyhow, the effect of this propaganda of creating fear is, that such fear is created on both sides. Because any measure taken by the nervous American

indicted for high treason after having exposed German re-armament, and left for Spain. He settled with his wife and family in the Island of Majorca but was arrested during the Spanish Civil War on the instigation of the Nazis and his family were sent back to Germany.

Efforts made by the WRI to secure his release only succeeded after the collapse of Germany in 1945 and after he had endured nine years' imprisonment in Franco Spain. On his release Heinz Kraschutzki immediately returned to Berlin and restarted his work for pacifism. Among his more recent writings are the pamphlet "East and West" (Peace News, 2d.), and the reports which have appeared in various international journals of the World Pacifist Meeting in India which he attended.

Government will excite the equally nervous Russian Government.

Anglo-American propaganda

A certain ingenuity of the American (and British) propaganda adds to this effect.

I have read several articles in the Anglo-American Press dealing with the question why President Roosevelt had allowed the Russians to advance so far in Europe; whether Churchill's plan not to invade France but the Balkans in 1944 would not have been better.

Imagine the effect of such opinions on the Russians!

Nobody has ever denied that the Russian nation has done its duty in a military way during the war. Such discussions as mentioned above simply mean, seen from the Russian point of view, that her former Allies have arguments among themselves as to whether it would not have been more convenient to betray the Russian Ally a little earlier. Under such circumstances nothing like an atmosphere of faith and goodwill can ever be established.

It is very difficult to understand the real situation in the countries East of the so-called Iron Curtain, even for people who may go there and talk freely to reliable friends, because their opinions are so different. A young member of the War Resisters' International in Eastern Berlin wrote me recently:—

"For us there is no question of 'East or West,' but only of 'Peace or War'

"There is much talk about Peace in this Eastern Republic. For us pacifists it should be a delight to live there. But once more we realise that an idea is a danger when there is too much loud talk about it. What is predominant there is not the will to Peace, but simply fear. It is the falsehood that fears the truth. This fear is infectious... But this fear does not lead to peace, it leads to desperation and to war.

"Meanwhile people tell us, as they always did, if the war should come, it would be to defend Peace. They are like those people in the theatres who make so much noise clamouring for silence.

"Worse are the attempts to erect an idea as an idol for our youth. The idea is fed with the well-known stuff: People, Fatherland, human rights, uniforms, badges etc. No wonder that many fanatics are already willing to fight for such an idea. From there the way to actual war is not long. I am always amazed when I see how a small group of men are able to inoculate so many with the idea of war. All means are good for such a purpose: Goethe, medicine, sausages, Bach, money, philosophy, technique, shoes, God, sea-side-trips, etc. Even the idea of Peace serves as propaganda for War.

"And yet I write these lines full of confidence. I believe in the power of the Good, so I believe in Peace..."

When fear is absent

I had a visit from a young teacher, a member of our movement living in the East of Berlin. He is not a member of the SED and says that two-thirds of the teachers in his region are not. He has met with but a few difficulties. As other teachers corroborated, one can maintain one's standpoint and even say one's opinion when one keeps to certain rules.

"The Russians know that I am not one of their men, but they equally know that I shall never act against them; so they tolerate me and even let me say a critical word when I think fit."

This remark leads us to an important point. As soon as fear is taken from the Russians they are quite considerate.

Whitsun peace parade

The famous Peace Parade of the Free-German-Youth at Whitsuntide (Peace News, June 9) was significant. I cannot say whether the West had the intention to create as much fear as possible deliberately, or whether those people really were full of fear as they pretended to be. Many people in Berlin, like myself, foresaw that nothing would happen. I have spoken with several sincere young people, pacifists and others. They all insist that they really meant peace.

Then I talked with a professor who is an old pacifist, and who was in England

VIENNA QUAKERS' PEACE MESSAGE

WE see quite clearly that there is a way whereby peoples can work peacefully together in solving the economic and political problems of our time. We are convinced that these problems cannot be solved by war and violence.

Our rejection of war springs from our faith in the unique value of every human individual, which we have been taught by Christ. Men have not the right to kill each other. Hatred begets more hatred, and violence leads to further violence. He who takes the sword will perish by the sword.

The manufacture of atomic weapons is a crime against humanity. The atom-bomb is not the only means of mass-destruction; and a war does not begin in the first place with the dropping of bombs; it has already begun when the spirit of hatred and mistrust is spread around.

We are opposed to the manufacture of ALL weapons, and to the training of men and women for military service.

It is our duty to emphasise the oneness of all peoples. Even when conflicts appear to be unsolvable, contacts between the peoples must be maintained.

The needs of the world are so great that we must not waste either time or means for purposes of war.

Corder Catchpool, PPU Sponsor writes: The origin of the above Peace Message of the Quakers in Vienna is of special interest. In June 1950 the Stockholm Peace Petition Committee organised a Congress in Vienna and invited other Peace Organisations of Austria to unite with them. At the Quaker-House in Vienna there meets regularly a Liaison Committee comprising some seven or eight different Peace Societies or Groups. These considered together the request to co-operate with the Stockholm Petition Committee, drew up the above statement of their united Peace Testimony, and agreed to send delegates to the Congress on that basis, if the terms were acceptable to the Petition Committee. They were accepted and participation in the Congress took place.

throughout the war but who is now in the Eastern Zone, a member of the SED. He called my attention to one important point:

During the Whitsuntide festivities the Communists pleaded for the recognition of the present frontier between Germany and Poland. That frontier has been the nightmare of Europe during nearly 200 years. The question is not whether it is fair, as it is now. The question is that it cannot be changed without a new war.

My friend reminded me of the time when we had both been pleading for the sincere recognition of the German-Polish frontier as it was in 1930, for the same reason that it could not be changed without a war. We found no response in the German youth then; they told us we were miserable traitors, etc.

Frontier settlements

This time, he said, though we know that the many who are from the East are very sad at having lost their homes, they accept the new frontier in the name of Peace. "Now is that not a success for the idea of peace for which we two were fighting together then?" he pleaded.

"Look at those hypocrites in the West! When, at Yalta and Potsdam, they consented to this frontier they would have condemned to one still further West in their hatred against the Germans. And now they tell the refugees not to settle definitely in Western Germany, but to wait for the day when they can return to Pomerania or Silesia, which can never be without a war. You see: Who is for peace? Those hypocrites in the West, or we who are willing to sacrifice something for the idea of Peace?"

I only quote such utterances to enable you to judge for yourself. There is one opinion I have met frequently: The people of the Eastern Zone of Germany are against genuine militarism and they claim to be so to a much higher degree than those of the West.

They say: "We have seen the militarism of the Right; now we are seeing that of the Left. We do not want either of the two."

The fact is that I am always very glad to meet pacifists from the Eastern Zone, who seem to be much more active and less sworn to fixed ideas than those of the West.

Old Acquaintance

"Ideals?"
You laughed and tossed your head.

"Ideals?"
Dismiss them with your youth;
you said.

And now... Oh, how I hope to
keep a few
Since I've re-met—unrealistic
you!

JON WINN-TYSON

B.B.C.—ALL HOME SERVICES

8.25 p.m. Sunday, August 27

Please listen in to

Professor Gilbert Murray, O.M.,

appealing on behalf of homeless children, the sick, aged, and other refugees

Please make this broadcast known among your friends

OXFORD COMMITTEE FOR FAMINE RELIEF

(Reg'd War Charities Act, 1940)

Donations should be sent to Professor Gilbert Murray at Barclays Bank, High St., Oxford

Space presented by Andrew Partners, Estate Agents, London, Oxford, and Eastbourne

Said in the House . . .

JULY 10, 1950

Mr. Emrys Hughes, (Lab., Ayrshire, South): I submit that there is a case for arguing that in this Finance Bill we are paying too much in taxation for preparing for another war. How Mr. Oliver Lyttelton can argue that with this huge financial burden we can possibly finance another war, I do not know. I do not know the answer to that, and when hon. Members opposite are warning that this country is facing possible bankruptcy, then surely they should say, "If we are practically bankrupt, there is no reason now why we should undertake policies which will impose further military expenditure and an increase in the burden of taxation."

Mr. Rhys Davies (Lab., Westhoughton): . . . The hon. Member for Stafford and Stone (Mr. H. Fraser) . . . was very disturbed about the money being spent on what is now termed the welfare State. But he seemed quite satisfied with the money spent on armaments. . . . The working people in this country are not satisfied to produce more merely to spend more money on war.

The National Debt of this country 30 years ago was £15 per head of the population. It is now more than £500. . . . When hon. Gentlemen say that the nation is bankrupt, I reply that it is the policy adopted by every Government in turn which has brought about this state of affairs. I wish to protest once more against the substance of this nation being employed upon adventures abroad when we ought to pay more attention to the necessities of our people at home.

JULY 12, 1950

After Mr. Ian Harvey (C. Harrow E.) had asked whether the Government endorsed a speech by Dr. Summerskill deplored the teaching of boxing in schools:

Mrs. Mann (Lab., Coatbridge and Airdrie): Most mothers heartily endorse what was said by the right hon. Lady—(hon. Members: "Nonsense!")—and hope she will go on saying it.

Mr. Emrys Hughes: Did not the full report of the speech say that boxing and the atom bomb were uncivilised, and was it not the most sensible speech we have had from the Government for many years?

Mr. Emrys Hughes: Can the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shinwell, Minister of Defence) assure us that no British lives are going to be thrown away in Korea? **Mr. Shinwell**: I think that question quite irrelevant.

Mr. Sorenson (Lab., Leyton): It would be advisable to acquaint the various education committees in the Colonial areas with the regulations and procedure of this country (regarding corporal punishment) . . . in some cases no regulations exist . . . and rather questionable practices are pursued.

JULY 13, 1950

The Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee): It is not intended to publish the report of the judicial inquiry (respecting Seretse Khama). The reasons for this decision are explained fully in paragraph 10 of the White Paper.

Mr. Sorenson: Does that mean hon. Members will not at any time be able to read the details of the report?

The Prime Minister: Yes, Sir.

Reason for withholding publication given in the White Paper was that the Report formed only a part of the evidence considered, and would present an incomplete and unbalanced picture, and that certain views expressed might mistakenly be attributed to the Government.—Ed. PN.

Mr. Emrys Hughes: Is the Prime Minister aware that in communiques from Tokyo there are reports of atrocities committed against American soldiers by Northern Koreans? Is he aware there are also very substantial reports of atrocities committed by South Koreans? Will he see that there is some objectivity in these reports?

Mr. Ellis Smith (Lab., Stoke-on-Trent): When is it intended to end conscription? **Mr. Shinwell**: The whole position will be reviewed when we consider the extension of the present National Service Act beyond the date of its expiry at the end of 1953.

JULY 14, 1950

Mr. Dribberg (Lab., Maldon): Under what section of the Penal Code were two Africans recently sentenced to death for rape in Kenya; and what are the terms of the section?

Mr. J. Griffiths (Colonial Secretary): I have asked the Governor of Kenya to supply the information requested.

JULY 17, 1950

Mr. Emrys Hughes: May I ask my hon. Friend (the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs) if he has any information about the Bishop of Korea; and, if Mr. Holt (British Minister in Seoul) is in the town on which 400 tons of bombs were dropped last week, what steps are being taken to secure his safety?

Will the Secretary of State give instructions to our representatives on the Security Council to ensure that precautions are taken to prevent the bombing of innocent non-combatants during bombing operations undertaken by the international police force?

Mr. Ernest Davies: I am confident that General MacArthur will take every possible precaution to prevent the bombing of non-combatants.

Mr. Emrys Hughes: Is the Minister aware that Mr. Trygve Lie has communicated to both sides a request to stop atrocities, and is not the dropping of 500 tons of bombs an atrocity?

Mr. E. Davies: In modern war the bombing of strategic objectives is one of the weapons which is used. The request of Mr. Trygve Lie applied, of course, to the application of the International Red Cross Convention to co-operate in fulfilling the terms.

Mr. J. Hudson (Lab., Ealing, N.): If it is one of the strategic purposes of war to drop bombs on towns, why does my hon. Friend tell the House that the Commander-in-Chief has received instructions to avoid the indiscriminate bombing of civilians?

Squadron-Leader Burden (C., Gillingham): Is it not a fact that the Air Forces of democratic countries do not bomb civilian populations, but are entitled to bomb military objectives, which is what they are doing?

Mr. E. Davies: Obviously the C-in-C is using his Air Force for military purposes, and military purposes only.

JULY 24, 1950

Commander Noble (Con., Chester): An official of the Civil Defence Staff College said: "They have got some of the biggest experts on that job (providing air raid shelters) and have worked out the cost to the country at between £500 and £600 million."

Mr. Emrys Hughes: According to some of our greatest authorities there is only one safe policy in the event of war, and that is to remove the population underground. I shudder to think what is likely to happen in the event of an atom bomb dropping in Glasgow, with its crowded tenements, with the worst slums in the world; and I cannot see the local authorities of Glasgow, in any conceivable space of time, being able to produce any practical policy of air-raid precautions likely to give anyone in that city any sense of security at all.

I should be far more convinced that the Government were acting on the right lines if they supported the Archbishop of York and said, "We realise that the dropping of the atom bomb in any part of the world would be a universal catastrophe and it is up to all of us, whatever different ideologies we may hold, to do everything possible to re-open negotiations in order that this problem might be placed on an international footing."

We know what happened when atom bombs were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. We find that out from an official report. In the light of that, and of the catastrophe it would be were atom bombs to be dropped on our cities, I submit that what has been said in this Debate has been largely irrelevant.

Lord Trenchard is regarded as one of the greatest authorities on aerial warfare, and in another place he made this assertion:

"Is there any doubt whatever in any man's mind that the atom bomb could probably destroy anything from 10 million to 20 million people in a month? I am not overestimating. . . . Hon. Members may have read about a month ago a statement drawn up by 12 of the most eminent scientists, strategists and physicists in the universities of America, who said that the present policy of the U.S. in regard to atomic warfare must inevitably mean "the obliteration of our nearest ally"—and "our nearest ally" is us.

Lady Tweedsmuir (Con., Aberdeen, S.): It is the duty of us here in Parliament to tell the people now what are the really constructive proposals that we have to offer for combating atomic warfare. I believe that if the fear of the effects of atomic bombing is largely removed the recruiting situation will be completely different.

Mr. Emrys Hughes made a speech which, in my opinion, was more calculated than any other I have heard to raise fear and despondency throughout the country. Furthermore it was a blatantly pacifist speech . . . just that kind which does more harm than any kind of rumour or fifth column.

Mr. Macdonald (Lib., Roxburgh and Selkirk): This war, if it comes will undoubtedly be the most terrible we have ever faced, but that is no cause for defeatism.

Mr. H. Brooke (Con., Hampstead): People often connected with the Association of Scientific Workers—that Communists permeated, if not dominated, organisation—have been coming forward and have been endeavouring to persuade innocent people that there is no defence at all.

Mr. George Thomas (Lab., Cardiff, W.): Does the hon. Member believe that only Communists are saying there is no defence against the atom bomb?

Mr. Brooke: I think a number of idealistic pacifists and others with the highest motives are saying that, but unfortunately they and everyone are exposed to a lot of pseudo-science put out with a good deal of money behind it from Communist sources.

Mr. George Thomas: I would remind the House that it was not the totalitarians who used the atom bomb in the last war; it was the Christian democracies.

(*Debate on World Government, page 7*)

"Was there ever a more sorry spectacle than that given in the recent war, of Christians destroying each other in mortal combats or air raids as they stoutly side with their respective governments to the exclusion of that Lord who should have been their Unbreakable Unity," asks Rev. A. D. Belden, DD, author of "Pax Christi."

THE CHURCHES AND THE ATOM BOMB

THE atomic bomb blew up much more than Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It blew up finally the orthodox Church endorsement of war.

This, since St. Thomas Aquinas, has been based upon the right to defend the vital interests of a community. So long as the weapons used left a decent chance of majority survival, that tremendous fallacy still had a show of reason. Roman Catholic scholars of repute were beginning to surrender the fallacy just before the recent war, in view of the destructiveness of the bombing aeroplane and the fact that defence could only be by mutual attack, and hence practically nil.

Now the appearance of atomic energy used for destruction plunges the whole ancient argument into the abyss. Scientists assure us that the bombs dropped on Japan were mere toys beside what can be constructed, and whereas they were equivalent to 20,000 tons of high explosive, plus disease effects at 100 miles radius the next dose will be 1,000,000 tons of high-explosive value, with utterly incalculable results.

What values physical, political, social, moral or spiritual can be defended against such a horror of destruction?

The Church then must think again, and think very simply about war.

The people all over the world are in danger of sinking into a fatalistic apathy. They have lost faith in statesmanship, and all political policies as means of delivering them from war—and war means now the Atomic bomb. What can the Churches do?

Was there ever a more sorry spectacle presented to the world than that given, in the recent war, of Christians destroying each other in mortal combat or air raids, as they stoutly sided with their respective governments to the exclusion of that Lord who should have been their Unbreakable Unity?

THE SUPREME BLASPHEMY

In spite of the reiteration of the creed "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church" and of solemn declarations that war is "irreconcilable with the spirit and example of the Lord Jesus Christ" the Churches of all communions the world over, with a few honourable exceptions, acted in a completely partisan manner, "breaking the body of Christ."

Modern war is mass-murder within the Holy Catholic Church—that is its supreme horror and blasphemy in the eyes of the sincere followers of Christ.

In view of this dreadful fact which is rapidly overtaking the conscience of the Church, and in view of the changed character of war in the modern world I do not believe it will be possible for any modern Christian denomination to endorse another world war with a good conscience, especially in the lurid light of the failure of this last one to defend the ideals for which Churchmen engaged in it.

The Church is at last face to face with the choice of ultimates—a final choice between Christ or the world. A Church that will not resist absolutely the racial suicide that is modern war, is conniving at its own physical and spiritual destruction. It will be rejected for its apostasy by both God and man.

The time has come for a wholesale return at all costs to Christ's own leadership. That lead is plainly indicated in His prayer recorded in John 17. "That they may be one . . . that the world may know . . . that the world may believe." Here is His way for His people in just such a world-crisis as ours.

The universal ban upon war of the universal Church must be proclaimed by official Christianity.

As Pax Romana has been succeeded by the Pax Britannica, and now by a Pax Americana, we must perfect the process by what the world has never yet seen, the Pax Christi, the Peace of Christ.

THE GREATEST INTERNATIONAL

What small Pacifist groups dotted over Christendom cannot accomplish, namely, stop the approaching world-catastrophe, the united massed strength of all Churches whatsoever has a real hope of achieving.

Christianity is the greatest international society in the world, and by all that is sacred it should prove the most solid and dependable.

Look at the figures—nominally there are 737,000,000 Christians in the world today, nearly half its population. Suppose we discount heavily for those included purely on the ground of nationality, and turn instead to the figures of the actual Churches for 30 years ago—that is a modest estimate.

There were then 225 million Roman Catholics, 175 million Protestants, 100 million Eastern Catholics. We will allow the millions comprising Christian Scientists, Spiritualists and other sects, who lean already in this direction to offset the margin of disobedience in the larger bodies. Even then we have a mass of humanity 500 million strong, who at the call of their respective Churches might set themselves as an impenetrable, unarmed living barrier across this advancing horror.

No civilised government could make war in the face of so gigantic a refusal, especially in view of the great moral sympathy and support that would be forthcoming from other religions and the rest of the world's population.

Is there a real prospect of official Christianity so acting? Yes, if sufficient Christians demand it. It must do so or incur the moral responsibility of a blood-guiltiness more terrible than it has ever dared to accept in the worst days of its history.

The very prospect of success, on behalf of the bleeding war-torn millions beyond the Churches, becomes the Divine imperative demanding its achievement.

We can if we wish to, rationalise our action afterwards superbly on Christian grounds—the immediate thing is to see the vision and obey it. Those of us who see the vision must clamour at the gates of Church-authority with ceaseless, remorseless vigour till it comes to pass.

MOBILISING THE CHURCHES

By such action as is suggested, the Church stands to win the moral leadership of the mass of common people the world over and to create a new moral and spiritual harmony through all forms of belief—the other world-religions included.

While this issue is being pressed upon the official circles of the Church, ample provision should be made for mobilising the membership of the Churches all over the world for such action.

There is ample reason to believe there are large numbers of Church members of every communion who are stopped just short of actual pacifism by the attitude adopted by the leadership of their Churches.

In the sacerdotal Churches this is naturally so. The people look for direction to the ecclesiastical authority. In the other Churches it takes rather subtler forms. In some cases it is a mere passing of responsibility over to one's pastor or denominational leaders. In other cases it is a genuine humble deference of the lay mind, which feels itself uninstructed in this issue, to the man of ideological training—yet in all these cases there are the rumblings of conscience and a deep feeling that war is wrong.

We should proceed at once to the enrolment of all Christians into what might be termed a League of Final Peace on the basis of a new Agreement of Unity entered into personally by all Christians everywhere under the most solemn rites of the faith.

The value of such an effort would be to give a mandate for action to our leaders. Then when the official side of our Churches arrive, as they are bound at last to do, at the moment for implementing this great and holy task, they will find a vast and already well-informed constituency awaiting them.

THE SUPREME LOYALTY

What about loyalty to freedom, democracy, social institutions? The supreme loyalty includes all these.

We cannot defend these things by rejecting Christ. In Him all good will be preserved and furthered. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

The alternative is the Atom bomb! War is the enemy—it is the only strength of dictatorship and tyranny. Violence, which is the instrument of greed and the root-cause of fear, must wilt in a non-violent world. The Church redeemed from this basic disobedience will qualify to reconstruct the social order.

Finally, if this is Christ's way, we may well expect a miracle. Not perhaps in the physical order, but in the moral and spiritual areas of being.

God's power distils at the point where faith passes into obedient action.

Its terrible absence from the modern Church with our resultant general weakness—not to be relieved by galvanic evangelisms or prosperous Churches sunk to the neck in worldly compromise—may be due far more than we have dared to think to our "breaking of the body of Christ."

Let that ban be called! The time is short!

ONE reason for backing Dr. Soper's view that he would rather we be overrun by Communist forces than have another war is, surely, that it is better even to die at the hands of terrorists than become one. And is not war terrorism *in excelsis*? With due apology to Shelley, it is as if terrorism creates "from its own wreck the thing it contemplates."

Some people feel certain that their country only declares war to suppress terrorism in another. Yet how, in effect does this work? This way of quenching terrorism does not always even remove the people responsible for it. At most it disposes of a few, but only after years of devastation and slaughter, and invariably by means far more hellish than any thought of before. The last word in terrorism, so far, is the atom bomb. But unless we renounce violence, a resurgence of terror threatens us with weapons even more diabolical. And it is sheer cant to pretend that our side will not use them.

Two wrongs never make a right, yet, under pretence of self-defence, many people still believe in this impossible task. So the defence they seek can but prove illusory, and one war can but bring another. However, while terrorism is used against inhabitants of other lands, few people admit it as terrorism. They call it a sad necessity, and behave as if out of sight out of mind.

Such blindness is amazing enough, but it is accompanied by another altogether gruesome—that is to terrorism in our own midst and against young people.

Just as concentration camps have for long been the bane of most lands, conscription is now the bane of practically all countries.

This most heinous form of terrorism is the premeditated, foul murder of vast numbers of young men, after such refinement of degradation as training them first to become murderers. I hear well-intentioned people protest that they can refuse; that in some countries there is conscientious objection.

Oh, this gauging of young men's consciences by judges intent on murder! Can anyone take it seriously? It provides escape for a few—precious few and not always the best. It is but the warmonger's compromise to lull the public and bring them to accept this martyrdom of their young men.

Why so blind to this, even in countries boasting of freedom? Rulers proclaim a man's freedom of choice sacred when he votes, and anyone who bribed him or gauged his conscience in time of voting would incur more than public disapproval. But when he is required to become a killer (even before he is a voter), it is a different story. Rulers and public then set out to weigh the most imponderable thing on earth—a human conscience. But if most people remain unaware of the real significance of this preposterous weighting, not so are the rulers. Should sincere objection procure exemption, so few would be soldiers or navy men or air men as to make militarism as voluntary an occupation as any other profession, but in this case not one sufficiently sought after to provide adequate forces for modern wars. So the fact that, even after the stir of conscientious objection conscription is more than ever in operation, provides the best evidence that this display of tolerance is but sham. Is, indeed, glaring proof that, out of men sent to war, a vast number are unwilling and just bullied into it.

I would like to add that having lived under German occupation in War I, and seen my relatives in France do likewise in War II, I am convinced that invasion, even in such a case when the nation invaded was a belligerent, is not the worse evil of war, nor the most degrading, nor the most deadly.

Obviously, the invasion of a non-belligerent nation would prove entirely different. If such a country would rather face it than declare war and intensify terrorism, then already is the mettle of the majority of its people spiritually undefeatable. And much would follow from this, eventually to the advantage of this land.

FRANCOISE DELISLE

62 Friern Park,
North Finchley, N.12.

Korea—Facts

IN view of the controversy over Korea, the following from the Methodist Recorder of June 29 may interest your readers.

The recent announcement by General Roberts, the American military advisor to the South Korean Government that between five and six thousand Communist Guerrillas had been exterminated on the Southern fringe of the Peninsula since last November may well have incited the Communist People's Republic in the North to take their revenge.

Apart from the articles on Korea on June 28 in your journal, no other paper had given this account which makes Peace News invaluable to me.

J. J. ALLEN

417 Westdale Lane, Mapperley, Nottingham.

Korea—Action

IT would seem that the meetings, demonstrations, etc., being held in the cause of peace in Korea, whilst gaining publicity with the discussions and the passing of resolutions, are of no avail.

What is really wanted is direct actions from the rank and file in the form of stoppage of work or token or sit down strikes in the factories, workshops and offices or-

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

ganised by the workers' trade unions, etc., until such time as hostilities or fighting ceases and negotiations are made for a peaceful settlement.

It would appear from the apathy existing, the people really want war: perhaps they do, until they are affected personally.

G. V. FRASER

77 Westdown Road,
Stratford, E.15.

Strike against War

WAR is so beastly, so despicable and so degrading an occupation that, in my opinion at least, we are justified in using any and every method of bringing it to an end.

Years ago, in 1913 to be precise, some of us were advocating the Strike against War. This method of combating war was taken up in this country, and more particularly in Germany and France, and might possibly have been successful in confining the first World War within a comparatively small compass had it not been that Jaurès was murdered just in time to prevent the Strike being called.

As it was some 2,000 men in Germany, conscripts, were shot incontinently for refusing to obey the orders to report to their battalions; a thing of which history for obvious reasons has no record; and when the Christmas of 1914 arrived Frenchmen and Germans and British were fraternising together in the front-line trenches, trades unionists and socialists as most of them were.

And it would seem that the time is now ripe to get into the working class movements of the countries of Europe particularly, with the gospel of the Strike against War. It would be an international strike of course; not merely a strike in Britain but in other countries also. Incidentally such a movement against war would bring the collapse of the dictatorships, a sufficient reason why the dictators would oppose it with all their might.

RICHARD HAWKIN

70 Duckworth Street,
Darwen.

Slaughter in Korea

GENERAL McARTHUR has a long and distinguished career as a soldier. McArthur began as a Lieutenant and observer in the Russo-Jap War, and in all the long years since he was described as an optimist. The General's report to the USA Congress is also worded on optimistic lines.

But eye-witnesses in Korea tell a different story. The Battle of Taejon is described as the most terrible encounter since the war began, "But our own divisions armed only with rifles, had to fight against the enemy who had adequate support from tanks." Those are the words of a senior U.S. Officer who escaped from the hell of Taejon.

Huge sums are now being voted in Congress to modernise weapons of war. Meanwhile the awful struggle continues. George Clemenceau, the deceased French politician, once said "War is too serious a business to be left in the hands of Generals."

UNO has failed as a body to settle international disputes peacefully and to promote disarmament. A strong and active organisation of all pacifists embracing the people of West Europe and U.S. should be established immediately.

RICHARD HOFFMAN

Berlin S.W.29

Germany.

Danbury Story

I HOPE your readers will re-read and preserve the wonderful story of the Danbury Prison (PN July 28) and how the Gospel of Love put into practice can make a mockery of military dictatorship.

This recalls the victory of our own COs in 1916 who were the pioneers of the absolutist position. Their experiences are described in "Troublesome People," price 7d. from the CBCO, 6 Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1. The type for the Danbury Prison was set by hand, so was the 1916 "Tribunal," forerunner of Peace News.

The outstanding persecution was that of the 36 men, led by Cornelius Barratt, who were tied by the thumbs for two hours every day, given crucifixion No. 1 and finally sentenced to death in a foreign country by Sir Douglas Haig and the High Command in the height of World War I.

H. WISHART

13 Railway Approach,

Worthing.

For Mediation

THE Circle of young Peace-friends, Hanover welcomes the offer of the Indian Government to mediate between the great powers, USA and USSR, in the Korea controversy. The Indian establishment that no fight should have started in Korea if their own people could decide about their country answers completely our own conviction. We realise Korea as one country (as the Indian note says) and we are convinced that the arbitrary boundary through the 38 degree of latitude is fateful because this must absolutely lead into conflicts.

Each war is a crime against humanity.

We are determined to support no war, neither direct nor indirect, and to work for removal of all causes of war. For that reason we condemn the armed advance of North Korea as well as the armed intervention of USA and other states.

We appeal to the youth of the world to follow the peace efforts of the Indian Government, not to participate in producing and transporting weapons and to work for a general moral outlawing of war.

JOSEPH-FRANZ BAYOR

Circle of Young Friends,
4 Schauburgstr,
Hannover-Herrenhausen, Germany.

Address required

MAY I ask a favour on behalf of a friend. One of my co-operators, Otto Hoeft, who spent the Nazi years underground met a John Olday, of London. He has been a long time without news, and would appreciate any hints as to his whereabouts. If it is possible to give us any information, we would be grateful.

ROSE LOHSE-LINK.

War Resisters' International,
Rosenbergstr 133,
Stuttgart, Germany.

Soil Fertility

I READ Newman Turner's article with interest and much agreement, but I felt that in certain respects he speaks more as an idealist than as an ecologist. Practical idealism is essential to this problem of soil fertility and the world population.

This problem will not be solved only by turning our sewage back into the land, or by increasing food supplies to the level of the population. The Creator did not, as Mr. Turner suggests, plan the population of the world as it is. Nor are there such things as "natural Population fluctuations."

The trouble, and here I am in agreement with Mr. Turner whole-heartedly, is due to science in the broader sense of the word—having encouraged a quite unnatural population, one for which the Creator cannot possibly be held responsible.

You may stave off disaster for a time by avoiding wastage, utilising all fertile or potentially fertile soil, abolishing latrines, and refining food, but eventually Malthus (who lived long before Lord Boyd Orr) will be proved right unless the unnatural causes of unnatural populations are removed.

JON WYNNE-TYSON

17a Pond Street,
N.W.3.

Training in Non-Violence

ESME WYNNE-TYSON'S article, with its honesty and foresight has been a great encouragement to me. Much as I admire Dr. Soper's uncompromising attitude and its timely expression, I feel very strongly that something much more exact and detailed is needed even than Christmas puddings or current buns dropped into the upturned mouths of the Kremlin statesmen.

I think it is desirable at this stage for pacifists to face quite seriously the prospect of Communist economics replacing capitalist ones all over the world, and whether in this country this comes by atomic warfare or otherwise may be beside the point, as in the first case there will probably be very few of us in a state to make our views heard.

There have been many occasions when the pacifist movement has been faced with an urgent challenge to examine what it has to offer in the way of non-violent resistance to an oppressing government. This is one of them.

Perhaps this is a time when at any rate some of us should withdraw part of our energies from propaganda and give ourselves up to the necessary study and self-training which is implied in what Esme Wynne-Tyson has to say to us. Down through the ages many systems for such training have been evolved. The pacifist might find their benefit in his individual life. He would certainly, in my opinion, find himself unable to be useful in such a situation as that described without the kind of basis which they might partially afford.

Very little can be done in the time. That is always true, however long or short the time is. But I believe that what I have briefly tried to indicate, and what I have already had some opportunity of discussing with other pacifists in the Non-violent Commission, is at any rate "direct action"—that is action directed, however feebly, to the real demands of the situation.

GWYNETH ANDERSON
170 Adelaide Road
N.W.3.

Open Letter to the Archbishop

I WOULD very much appreciate it if you would allow me to use your columns to write what constitutes an open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

He has recently announced in his Diocesan Gazette that he wishes to warn all his clergy against signing the Peace Petition sponsored by the British Peace Committee.

I would like to ask him this question: Am I not right in believing that 2,000 years ago

man had revealed to him the Truth, in the form of the Saviour Jesus Christ and that He taught us quite specifically to think evil of no man? My interpretation of that is that it is wrong even to think evil, let alone act on the assumption of evil.

Modern psychology has absolutely nothing on the psychology taught and preached by Christ 2,000 years ago, the basis of which was the simple injunction: Think positively; Never think negatively.

In every situation in life it is possible to think either good or evil of a thing. Let us take for instance, the present World situation and the endeavour by some people to advance the cause of Peace through the Peace Petition. According to the simple principles of Christian ethics, when faced with the question, "Will you sign the Peace Petition?" the Christian should say, "Yes, of course I will, for Peace is good." That is positive thinking.

On the other hand he may say, "Oh, I don't think I ought to sign. It might be backed by Communists." That is negative thinking, and it is fundamentally wrong for a Christian to take that attitude. For he has the chance of either making a gesture for good or for evil, and in opposing something which is fundamentally good, he is thereby creating evil in the world.

Why is it that people will oppose something which is fundamentally God? I believe it is for this reason. That we live in an age when the worst disease of all is negative thinking. We always tend to think that something might be wrong, before we think of the possibility of it being right. Surely the behaviour of men and women today is proof of this fact. When mens minds and hearts are filled with fear, how can they react decently and normally?

However much we may think there is evil in the minds of the Communists we must remember that we, the Western Democracies, dropped the first atomic bombs, and thereby created in the minds of millions of people on this earth a feeling of hate rather than love. Years and years and years will not wipe out that fatal blemish on the so-called Christian Democracies of the world. We have a lot of leeway to make up before we can begin to set ourselves up as an example of goodness to the rest of the world.

I would like to ask the Archbishop this question. As the Leader of the Church of England how can he justify his action in thinking negatively and not helping any cause for good such as a petition for Peace?

Christ has taught us to fear no evil. Personally I have no fear of Communism. The Spirit of Christ in me is such that I have no doubt whatever that if some evil power walked into my house with the idea of murdering my family, the power of Christ's Healing in me would be such that the hatred of the intruder would be turned to Love. I cannot fathom why the Archbishop himself should be so lacking in this spiritual power as to resort to negative thinking on the question of Peace.

C. R. WOODWARD

80 Harley Street,
London, W.1.

Two Alternatives

WARS are possible as long as they are bearable. In this sense the atomic weapons promise peace. They represent the logical development of all weapons—the easiest and most complete annihilation of the enemy.

Not to use the atom bomb and similar weapons in war is to prolong the agony and increase the tragedy. There can be only two logical approaches to the problem: either use every weapon available and once, or disarm completely. Call war off or put every ounce of effort into it with no regard at all for scruples, and no consideration for moral principles.

Perhaps if this were more widely understood, we would see the "fors" and "againsts" more sharply defined. Plainly, the position is this: anyone who thinks accepts war under any circumstances whatever, is morally responsible for all wars.

The "last resort" is always reached because war is the easiest solution and mankind will always take the path of least resistance. As for the just and unjust wars, what seems just to one side will seem unjust to the other, and so in accepting the just we have the unjust thrust upon us.

The harm done by war starts in peace. It is between wars that men's minds are contaminated by the thoughts which lead to war. An action contemplated is equivalent to an action taken, in its effect on the mind and spirit. The murderer commits his crime twice—once in the intention and again in the execution.

Those then who do not reject war, are already at war. What use to ask "how can we prevent it?" At best they can only hope for a postponement, for the problems which beset the world are not easy of solution. Only when war is rejected "hook, line and sinker" can our efforts be concentrated on how to run the world without it.

G. S. COOPER

253 Croydon Road,
Wallington, Surrey.

I RENOUNCE WAR AND I WILL NEVER SUPPORT OR SANCTION ANOTHER
This pledge, signed by each member, is the basis of the Peace Pledge Union. Send YOUR pledge to
P.P.U. HEADQUARTERS
Dick Sheppard House, Endsleigh St., WC1

World Government debated in Parliament

HISTORY was made on July 28 when the House of Commons debated World Government.

While pacifists will be disappointed, and many Crusade for World Government adherents dissent from Mr. Henry Usborne's assertion that World Government supporters were "four square behind the United Nations" in opposing aggression in Korea, the fact that the case for World Government has been written into Hansard is a forward step.

In the course of the one-and-a-half hours debate Mr. Usborne said:

To the ordinary citizen the message of Communism has two compelling attractions. It serves as a beacon to the under-privileged and the oppressed; and it poses as the champion of the poor and hungry against the power of the strong and the rich. It offers an answer—specious though it undoubtedly is—to that burning question: can war be ended so that man may live; and how can the scientific knowledge of our age be used for constructive purposes and prevented from destroying the world?

To this second question the orthodox Marxist will reply: "War is inherent in the nature of capitalism, and it can only be ended when capitalism is overthrown. Western Christendom has not yet disproved this assertion. We have not yet exposed the fallacy of this spurious dialectic."

Now the tide of Communism cannot be turned unless the message with which we answers those two questions with other solutions than the Communists can.

We must also be able to explain shortly and concisely how the solution for which we can, and will, provide the world with genuine justice.

For us, who have already achieved release from serfdom, who no longer suffer from poverty and hunger, political freedom is a sacred flame for the maintenance of which most of us would die; for which, in two world wars, our youth believed they gave their lives.

"But for the majority of mankind it is almost meaningless. Moreover in Asia it means exactly the opposite to what we are doing. It means the expulsion of the white hegemony."

The mass of the people endure unending hunger and grinding poverty; they still suffer the paralysing indignity of being regarded as second class citizens. It is against this intolerable injustice that man now stirs in indignant wrath.

Cold war is a civil war

The cold war is not, as it sometimes merely a struggle between Soviet and Anglo-American forces, it is a civil war bent on tearing down a fabric which allows such things to happen.

A civil war can only be ended when government, law and order, take its place. A mere military strengthening of the forces of the West offers no solution. Indeed, the stronger the West becomes the more the under-privileged, the and hungry will hate us for our power; the more certain it is that in the end we will be defeated.

"We can never win by being powerful. Paradoxically, though, we can never win by being woolly-minded."

"What is required? Peace; Justice; Freedom, in that order. But there can be peace without justice, no justice without freedom. Nor can there be any political freedom in the sense we desire it, unless there

is government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Where UNO fails

Is UN by any stretch of imagination a representative assembly?

The USSR, India and China, together containing half of the world population, cast only 10 per cent. of its votes. The 20 Latin-American Republics, regarded by many as the satellites of the USA represent 7 per cent. of the population of the United Nations but they cast 40 per cent. of the votes.

In the General Assembly which chooses the members of the Security Council, Luxembourg and India each have one vote. Luxembourg has a population of 300,000, India over 300 million.

The United Nations Charter manifestly needs to be altered . . . there must be one central authority."

Powers of World Government

Mr. Usborne then went on to outline the powers which the British Parliament would have to hand over to the central authority:

1. The monopoly of armed force: Britain would no longer control the Royal Navy which would become an integral part of a world police force;

2. Atomic development;

3. Raising of some revenue and the fixing of rates of exchange;

4. Control of food and raw materials. A People's Constituent Assembly ought to be organised, he said, as follows:

First, the peoples of the nations, and not the nation-states themselves, should be represented, on a basis of one per million of their inhabitants.

The Assembly should draft a new charter for the United Nations—one which, incidentally, makes some sense of the first words of its Preamble: "We the people."

Meeting place: India

We should invite Mr. Nehru and Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, jointly, to sponsor this Assembly and ask them to find a town in Indo-Pakistan where it could conveniently meet and to it all the peoples of the world should be invited to send their representatives.

At this point I know that I shall be asked whether I realise what might happen in this Assembly if the Communist delegates outnumbered the rest. As is the case with any Select Committee, a minority, if it feels impelled to do so, can submit a minority report. We already know in considerable detail the Communist plan for world government; and what we know we do not much admire.

"But what we have not had, and for the lack of it the world is now in danger of perishing, is the democratic alternative."

What form of World State do the democracies envisage? What would we consent to join? The United Nations is obviously now inadequate, it does not provide the tangible evidence of a world citizenship status without which that prevailing sense of under-privilege and injustice can never

be eliminated from the minds of four-fifths of the human race.

"Sooner or later, as Mr. Churchill has said, we shall have to bring matters to a head with the Soviet Union. If ever we do there is only one ultimatum which is feasible. The alternative is utter destruction."

Our offer to USSR

There is only one proposal for 'unconditional surrender' that makes any sense at all. It will be to offer inclusion as an equal partner in a World Federal Government which has been tried and not found wanting.

Nor should we, the British, or the Americans for that matter, have the responsibility of proposing its acceptance. For nothing we can say to the Russians, it seems, is likely to greatly to influence them.

The pressure for acceptance of this new ideal will be applied, not by us, but by those Asians whose leadership and inspiration will have brought the Union to birth. Our contribution, which these Asians will never forget, is that, when they asked for it, we gave them freedom. Their desire, and our only hope now, is that they in their turn may show the world the way to peace.

I believe, with God's help, that they could do it if we in Britain only have the courage and the vision to play our part."

Support from Conservatives

Speeches in support of Mr. Usborne were made by:

Mr. J. R. Tilney (Con., Liverpool, Wavertree): "We can achieve a Government of the free world by the free world for the free world . . . confound the Communist prophets . . . With a single Defence force save our overheads . . . and fill our Western ports with an expanding trade."

Mr. I. J. Pitman (Con., Bath): "It is one of the astonishing evidences of the truth of Christianity that the moment man individually gave up his rights of self-defence and his sovereign right to draw his armour, he actually gained."

Mr. Leather (Con., Somerset, N.): "Many of us feel that there is almost a conspiracy to prevent it (World Government) being discussed in this country."

Mr. Snow (Lab., Lichfield and Tamworth) also spoke in support.

Government reply

Mr. Ernest Davies, Foreign Under-Secretary, replied for the Government and said that putting the ideal into practice presented great difficulties for "those of us who are concerned with the practicalities of world affairs today."

The principle of collective security, on which the United Nations is founded, must on occasions meet force with force. Sometimes it is necessary to make war to maintain peace.

After Mr. Davies had spoken Mr. Usborne wound up by saying: "My hon. Friend has talked about collective security. Is it not a fact that it is based on an alliance which all history shows never works? It is not collective; and it is not secure. But World Government is both."

Up and doing!

PEACE AND THE PEOPLE

RECENT experiences from numerous areas demonstrate how much more ready people are to consider the pacifist position.

At Sybil Morrison's Thursday lunch hour meeting in Lincoln's Inn Fields, 80 copies were sold where previously two dozen was the weekly average. Fred Prior at Bournemouth has doubled his order; Southampton Contact Member for PPU reports such encouraging results from PN sales efforts that it is hoped shortly to restart the group. A variety of similar encouraging results could be cited.

New readers are themselves ordering extra copies and sending subscriptions for their friends, an indication of the untapped energies for peace awaiting our initiative.

But a much more vigorous lead is needed from regular readers and pacifist groups if we are not to lose the support of thousands of potential pacifists.

Here are three specific jobs for which we need help.

1. London Peace Council, Trafalgar Square Peace Demonstration, 3 p.m. Sunday, Sept. 3. The LPC is not Communist dominated. It will rally thousands of sincere peace seekers to the Square. Will you come and sell Peace News and distribute pacifist literature? Meet 2 p.m. onwards, all supplies at foot of St. Martin's steps.

2. Regular PN sellers needed for Marble Arch on Sundays (Dr. Soper's afternoon meeting, PPU evening meeting); for Tower Hill, Wednesday lunch-hour (Dr. Soper's meeting); for Lincoln's Inn Fields, Thursday lunch-hour (Sybil Morrison's meeting) and at all other public Open-Air Forums all over the country.

3. House to house selling. A number of readers report many friendly responses and good sales from this work. An hour devoted to it every week will gain many supporters. Please send a card offering your help. Further particulars will gladly be sent.

HFM

Circulation last week, 10,000 copies. Sold out again!

Home news in brief

IPSWICH: A large quantity of books, pamphlets and Peace News were sold and leaflets distributed from a Peace Pledge Union stall organised by the local group at the Co-op. and Labour fete attended by over 30,000 people.

LIVERPOOL: An open-air meeting was held on Peace Day, sponsored by the Merseyside region of the Peace Pledge Union. A strong audience supported the speakers—Eric Hughes, Alan Litherland and Bernard Rushton—and PN sold well.

No hostility was felt from the crowd.

MALVERN: The most likely result of a third world war would be the spreading of Communism or possibly something worse; The preparation for such a war may itself cause the disintegration of society: these were among the conclusions reached by a group of fifty young people who met at the Fellowship of Reconciliation's International Youth Conference.

Notes for your Diary

Saturday, August 26

LONDON, S.E.: Women for Peace Demonstration; Rally points: 2 p.m. Lambeth Town Hall, 2.45 Camberwell Green, 3.30 Rye Lane; 1.45 Woolwich, Beresford Square, 2.30 Greenwich Church, 3.15 Marquis of Granby; 2.15 Lewisham Old Town, 3.15 Marquis of Granby; All proceeding to Hardcastle St. site near Rye Lane for meeting at 4 p.m.; Women's Action for Peace Movement.

Sunday, August 27

FINSBURY PARK: 11 a.m. Open-air meeting, North London Region, PPU. **RYDE PARK**: 7 p.m. Open-air meeting: PPU.

GLASGOW

7 p.m. Brunswick Street, Open-air meeting: PPU.

Monday, August 28

TOWER HILL: 1 p.m. Speakers: Jack Sutherland and Gwyneth Anderson; PPU.

Wednesday, August 30

SHEFFIELD: 7.30 p.m. Evening ramble; Meet Beachill PO; PPU.

Thursday, August 31

LONDON, W.C.2: 12.30 p.m. Lincoln's Inn Fields; Open-air Meeting; Sybil Morrison; PPU.

Friday, September 1

LONDON, W.C.2: 1.30-1.45. St. Martin-in-the-Fields; Intercession Service for Peace; The Rev. Paul Gliddon; APF, F.O.R. and P.P.U.

Sunday, September 3

MANCHESTER: 2.0 p.m. United Peace Procession, Ardwick Green to Platt Fields; 3.30 p.m. Open-air meeting; Rhys J. Davies, M.P., and Sybil Morrison. Volunteers please write to Fred Barton, Friends Meeting House Manchester 2; SoF, F.O.R., PPU, Women's International League, Women's Co-op Guild.

Wednesday, September 6

LUTON: 8 p.m. Friends' Meeting House, Castle St.; John Barclay, organiser of the International Help for Children, will speak on his recent visit to Greece, and the work of the IHC; PPU.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

LATEST TIME for copy: Monday before publication.

TERMS: Cash with order. 3d. per word, minimum 2s. 6d. (Box No. 6d. extra). Please don't send stamp in payment, except for odd pence. Maximum length: 50 words. Address for Box No. replies: Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, N.4.

When corresponding with PN about an advertisement, quote its first words, classification, and date.

We reserve the right to hold over advertisements and to limit the frequency of continuing advertisements.

MEETINGS

WEIGH HOUSE Church, Duke Street, W.1. (Bond St. Tube), Sunday evenings at 7. The Gospel of Peace Social hour follows.

ACCOMMODATION

ACCOMMODATION AVAILABLE. Vegetarian and diet reform. Others welcomed. Sea front, small village. Innissfree, St. Mary's Bay, Ashford, Kent.

DERBYSHIRE HILLS, Vegetarian Guest House. Rest and comfort amid beautiful scenery. Arthur and Catherine Ludlow, The Briars, Crich, Near Matlock. Tel: Ambergate 44.

CAN ANYONE find flat or accommodation in or near London for pacifist family of three adults who urgently need peace and quiet? Box 197.

PACIFIST URGENTLY requires accommodation in good house, with use of kitchen. S.W. London preferred. Box 188.

UNFURNISHED FLAT, 2 rooms—kitchenette, etc. Suit one lady. 35 miles from London. Box 196.

PERSONAL

ALL MEMBERS of the Christian Church interested in World Federation as a way to permanent peace should write to World Union, 106 Parkway, N.W.1.

MARRIAGE BUREAU offers unrivalled personal service. Nation-wide clientele. Mary Blair (Room 69), 147 Holborn, E.C.1.

SEVERELY DISABLED young man, age 22, desires young lady of similar age to correspond. Box 194.

BIRTH

TO IVY and Harry Mister, on Saturday, August 5, a sister for Jeffery, Gillian and Valerie. 27 Broad Oak Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex.

EDUCATIONAL

PACIFISTS WISH recommendation boarding school for boy aged 8, South or West England. Box 195.

LITERATURE, &c.

QUAKERISM Information and Literature respecting the Faith and Practice of the Religious Society of Friends, free on application to the Friends' Home Service Committee, Friends' House, Enstone Rd. London.

FOR SALE & WANTED

LEASEHOLD HOUSE for sale, Hampstead, near Heath and buses. Vacant possession, ground floor and basement. £2,000. Blatchford 78 South Hill Park, N.W.3.

MARRIED MAN experienced kitchen gardener lost war, seeks situation, accommodation. Box 199.

GESTETNER DUPLICATING, every variety. Mabel Eyles, 396 Hornsey Road, London, N.19. ARC 1765/MOU 1701.

SITUATIONS AND WORK WANTED

MAN, 41, NEURASTHENIC, seeks quiet routine work, needing little or no supervision. Box 193.

MARRIED MAN experienced kitchen gardener lost war, seeks situation, accommodation. Box 199.

GESTETNER DUPLICATING, every variety. Mabel Eyles, 396 Hornsey Road, London, N.19. ARC 176

In Defence of Human Rights
**U.N. BURN VILLAGES
IN KOREA**

THE bombing and burning of the cities and villages of Korea by the forces of the United Nations is making nonsense of both the universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the General Assembly and of the statements made in the House of Commons by the Foreign Under-Secretary, Mr. E. Davies, and quoted on page four of this issue, that "General Mac-Arthur will take every possible precaution to prevent the bombing of non-combatants."

Official reports on the total destruction of towns and villages, which are defenceless and without ARP, imply that thousands of innocent civilians have been murdered and had their homes burned down. One such instance is quoted at the top of Sybil Morrison's column on this page.

Article I of the Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of U.N.O. on December 10, 1948, declares: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

"Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person," declares Article 4.

"No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home etc. (Art. 13)."

"Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realised." (Art. 29).

Is the war in Korea being conducted with a view to the above Declaration?

Reports coming in from India, quoted by Reuter, indicate "abhorrence of the involvement of Asians in what Indians consider essentially a quarrel between the US and the Soviet Union. The unpopularity of the US is growing."

For the sake of the common people of Korea, and not merely in order to save Britain from a third world war, there must be mediation in Korea.

Any attempt to drive the Northern forces back to the 38th parallel and to "liberate" South Korea after it has been "liberated" by the North will leave the country a shambles.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS
F.A.U.I. INTERNATIONAL SERVICE

STEEP, PETERSFIELD, HANTS.

THE next training camp for probationary members will begin on August 8th, 1950. Pacifists wishing to join the Service should apply immediately to the above address.

Emrys Hughes, M.P.

writes every week in

FORWARD

On sale everywhere — Friday 2d.

Postal subscription 13s. yearly

from **FORWARD**, 26 Civic Street, Glasgow, C.4.

CONSCRIPTION and CONSCIENCE

CONFERENCE

for boys between the ages of 16 - 18

AT

FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, N.W.1

ON

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1950

from 11 a.m.—6.30 p.m.

11 a.m. **CONSCRIPTION and CONSCIENCE**
DENIS HAYES

Followed by

PICNIC LUNCH, DISCUSSION GROUPS,
TEA (provided), REPORTS (OF GROUPS)

Enquiries and applications to attend to:

FRIENDS PEACE COMMITTEE
FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, N.W.1

Hull Peace Council will "oppose all war propaganda"

THE people of one of the most heavily bombed cities of Britain, Hull, are to be asked to sign a Peace Petition addressed to the House of Commons asking for increased efforts on the part of the Government to secure an immediate cessation of hostilities and world disarmament.

The Petition is being organised by the recently formed Hull Peace Council, sponsored by cultural, religious and political parties and trade unions and having as its aims:

1. To promote co-operation amongst all interested in peace and goodwill between nations and peoples throughout the world.
2. To oppose all propaganda using inaccurate, distorted or exaggerated information likely to rouse fear of or hostility towards other peoples and to gather and publicise all facts and information necessary for the presentation of the truth.
3. To work for policies which will secure the understanding and co-operation of the peace-loving majorities of all countries so that international differences may be settled by international mediation and peaceful negotiations.
4. To organise and hold meetings and public gatherings to deepen and widen the sense of civic and national responsibility for peace and goodwill.
5. To oppose policies which seek to obtain security only through the building up of superior military forces.

Hull residents may obtain copies of the petition from Miss V. A. Mitchell, 62 Blake Street.

Plans are in hand for a public meeting to be held at the end of October when it is hoped that Dr. Olaf Stapledon and either Vera Brittain or Prof. Kathleen Lonsdale will speak.

War disabled for London demonstration

ON Sunday, September 3, men and women disabled during the last world war will appeal to the people of London to join with them in a pledge to outlaw atomic weapons and work for peace. The London Peace Council has called a great meeting in Trafalgar Square on the anniversary of the last war.

Mrs. Joan Thompson, BA, JP, has written a moving plea to her fellow Londoners to join in the work of peace. Mrs. Thompson, who will speak at the meeting, was herself the only patient left alive when in 1944 a flying bomb hit the hospital ward where she was lying ill. After innumerable operations she has been left with a permanently crippled body and a burning hatred of the horrors of war. She will herself speak at the anniversary meeting.

Arrangements are being made to bring to the meeting all those disabled men and women who wish to support Mrs. Thompson in her appeal.

The London Peace Council was set up by a Peace Conference initiated by members of the British Peace Committee and others held at the St. Martin's School of Art, W.C.2., in May last and attended by delegates of 150 organisations. Its objects are to co-ordinate and stimulate activity for peace in every part of London and among every type of organisation.

Offices are at 10-11 Fetter Lane, E.C.4.

World News in Brief

YUGOSLAVIA

THE British National Peace Council, which represents 40 Peace organisations, has accepted an invitation from the Yugoslav National Committee for the Defence of Peace to send out a deputation from Britain.

A statement issued by the Yugoslav Committee declares that they "condemn the armaments race and oppose the use of the atom bomb and other means of mass destruction."

FRANCE

Jean Bernard Moreau was released from prison on July 3 on completion of his second sentence. He has been given a document releasing him from further military service and stating that he will not be called up again except in the event of war.

ITALY

A letter appealing to the President and Prime Minister to study seriously the Bill before Parliament granting CO rights has come from a group of prominent Americans including John Haynes Holmes, Norman Thomas, Roger Baldwin and Senator Baldwin.

MALAYA

Led by the three Malayan delegates to the World Pacifist Meeting in India, a "Malayan Society of Peace Lovers," was recently inaugurated in Kuala Lumpur. Contact with the group can be made through Yan Kee Leong, PO Box 97, 333 Rahang Road, Seremban, Malaya.

On June 15, the Malayan delegates had a short talk with Pandit Nehru during the latter's brief visit to Malaya.

REARMING WILL LEAD TO WAR — Dr. Soper

"IT strikes terror, almost, in my mind to listen to news of rearmament, the recall of Parliament, and of the terrible armaments race which, if pursued, will undoubtedly engulf the world in cosmic war in which the results will be incalculable except in terms of human misery," said Dr. Donald Soper at a meeting in Newcastle organised by the Society of Christian Witness during last weekend.

"If only a few more people in England, Germany, Russia, and China were so empowered and enlightened by the love of Jesus, even if they were not a majority, even such a minority might stand between man and the irretrievable ruin that threatens him."

And Communism?

"Why is Communism successful? It will always be successful while people live in squalor and while most of the people on this planet have not enough to eat."

"Much that Communists teach is grievously wrong but they are at least precise and informative. They are wrong but relevant. Christians are right, but how woolly they are."

WHERE FREEDOM IS IN PERIL

WHEN Mr. Dingle Foot addressed the Liberal Summer School last weekend, he asked: "Are we to grant freedom of speech, publication and assembly to those who would destroy these freedoms if they had a chance?"

And he answered: "Yes; freedom of speech must mean freedom of speech for Oswald Mosley and Harry Pollitt."

Attacking the racial and anti-Communist legislation in South Africa and the anti-Communist law in Australia, Mr. Dingle Foot said that by no stretch of imagination could it be said that either were observing the Declaration of Human Rights to which they subscribed in 1948.

At an earlier session, Mr. Edward Crankshaw, author and expert on Russia, gave this warning: "We are so afraid of wishful thinking that many of us have stopped thinking. We are so afraid of appeasement that many have forgotten that agreement is the whole basis of society."

"Witch hunt" victims

THE supposedly international and non-political Boy Scouts organisation has proven itself, once again, most cruelly political and nationalistic. It has expelled a 17-year-old for collecting signatures to a peace petition.

Jeffrey is to write the Chief Scout about this embargo on a youngster finding his first legs in reading of searches for truth by various philosophers and other writers.

The charge, as usual, is that Jeffrey is a "Red."

Unilever, owner of Stork Margarine, has fired or has forced the resignation of a number of employees for alleged "Red" sympathies.

One victim is Miss Nora Edwards of Bebbington, who is not a Communist, but is secretary of the Merseyside Peace Committee. Her union is taking the matter up with Lever Bros. and Unilever's London office, which, so far, disclaims all knowledge of any dismissals.

New threat to UNESCO

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) was founded five years ago to "promote peace and security by means of education, science and culture."

American insistence that UNESCO enter the cold war as a propaganda medium has been heightened; this has produced a crisis which threatens to wreck the whole organisation, reports the News-Chronicle, August 14.

The U.S. "requests" to UNESCO for support became more definite after the Korean situation began. Now the Director-General, Senor Torres Bodet, has threatened to resign. With him, if he goes, will go most of the executive. UNESCO has already, before, given a flat "No" to the U.S. demand that she become a psychological warfare bureau for the Western powers.

Our duty: All-out resistance

THE fighting in Korea, like the rest of the cold war, is part of a competition between two totally irresponsible power-groups: both are the enemies of humanity in all countries, and neither is worth the loss of a single life, English, Russian, American or Korean. It is hard to see how many of us can escape the duty of all-out resistance to both of them.

—Alex Comfort, Tribune, Aug. 11, 1950.

Sybil Morrison's CAMPAIGN COLUMN

This afternoon from villages on the West bank of the Nakdong River thin spirals of smoke have been ascending . . . It is essential if the Nakdong line is to be held that a broad, bare glacis should be created on the further bank. It is a ruthless expedient, but then this is an exceptionally stringency being taken.

—Daily Telegraph Special Correspondent, Aug. 5, 1950.

If one tries to end strife by strife, there will be strife for ever. Forbearance alone can end strife, and this is truly a precious law.

—Sayings of Confucius

FIVE years after the atom bomb was dropped in order, as we have been told, to shorten the war and save British and American lives, America is once again at war, and Britain is involved to the extent of one thousand million pounds per year on armaments, full support for the war in Korea, and the probable extension of National Service from eighteen months to two years.

The propaganda to justify these proceedings is in full spate; Mr. Malik's proposal for a "cease fire" in Korea and an opportunity for the North Korean case to be heard at the Security Council, is condemned out of hand as a "spurious peace proposal," the war in Korea is described, in passionate and colourful language, as an essential challenge to the Communists' threat to freedom; the voice of Mr. Churchill once more thunders for a mighty army as the only bulwark against the forces of totalitarianism.

The majority of people accept this point of view without question and continue to believe that the intransigence is all on one side, and that the only answer to it is the war, that in their hearts they hardly dare to contemplate. But that very war, which the ordinary person in this country believes can be staved off by fighting a war somewhere else, is, in fact already begun.

War comes to the villages

We cannot escape the bitter knowledge of what is happening in Korea.

This "exceptionally ruthless war" made the justification for such methods as the obliteration of whole villages in order to prepare a battleground, which must not be hampered by human beings and their impedimenta of houses, shops, farms and forests. In those villages which are now totally destroyed, there would be many who could not escape — children, babies, old people and helpless invalids—but, because the lives of American soldiers depended upon it, these "innocents" have died, and whole communities have been wiped out.

But this is war; this unnatural and cruel perversion of the ordinary kindly instincts of the human race. If the American soldiers, whose lives must be saved at the cost of this monstrous ruthlessness, were to become, even for one moment, men instead of soldiers, they would be aghast at the means by which, it is alleged, they can secure freedom for mankind. In fact they have not had the freedom to choose what they will do, let alone to know what it is they are doing.

The time may come, and perhaps before very long, when the loss of British lives, and the total destruction of British towns and villages will also be justified on the grounds that American, or possibly Russian lives, will thereby be saved.

All have the right to live

The truth is that every human being has the right to life, and freedom which cannot be gained except by the violation of that right, is no freedom at all; on the contrary, it is an imprisonment from which there is no escape, except through the complete renunciation of that doctrine of evil, which teaches that bad means can secure good ends.

If the desired end is peace it is necessary to follow peaceful ways whatever the cost may be; if victory for peace is to be won, the means of war must be discarded; truth must rout the propaganda lies; forbearance and understanding must replace biased and blinkered committee procedure; kindness and compassion must remove bitterness and hatred; neither strength, nor weakness, but goodwill must be the basis for negotiation. This is pacifism; and it is the only hope for the human race today.

ROYHILL HOLIDAY CENTRE BLACKBOYS, Nr. UCKFIELD SUSSEX

Visitors came last week from Italy, France, Sweden, Holland, America, as well as from many parts of Great Britain.

* Vacancies Aug. and Sept.

Comfortable accommodation, lovely country, Good fellowship, Charge 70/- per week.

ON YHA L After K A Pea Midlan Atomic W Hos MORE over Ashbridge, International This R where chou concerned movement country by accommodat scattering Royal Alt Birthday Association It is to schoolteach movement the pr rapidly ar through t secretaries, hostels, sp In 1932 Federatio Australi Australian First po This ye being hel visitors fr Scotland. The pro most imp plays of f countries fascinatin, which the opportunit many int I spoke Norway, I were six Germany, and Pacific se produced evening's Tunisia, Scotland, Under who has move matters o between the together those from Reti BRIGA married Oxford. The no the follow Quarters Smo Report worker formed w